

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 24, 2006, Applicants amend their application and request reconsideration in view of the amendments and the following remarks. In this amendment, Claim 1 is amended, no claims have been added, and Claim 10 has been cancelled without prejudice so that Claims 1-9 are currently pending. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-9 were provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as claiming the same invention as that of Claims 1-9 of copending Application Serial Number 10/688,171. Application Serial Number 10/688,171 has been amended to incorporate a new set of claims and thus the rejection is now moot.

Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,251,134 to Alt et al. (Alt). Claim 10 was rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,623,518 to Thompson et al. (Thompson). Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0135266 to Chew et al. (Chew). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 10, Applicants have cancelled Claim 10 without prejudice and therefore, the rejection is moot.

With respect to the remaining rejections, anticipation exists only if all of the elements of the claimed invention are present in a system or method disclosed, expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference. Therefore, if it can be shown that there is one difference between the claimed invention and what is disclosed in the single reference, there can be no anticipation.

Neither of the references discloses or suggests the offset bridge design as claimed in amended Claim 1. Since this feature is not disclosed or suggested,

there can be no anticipation. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5, 6, 8 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over Alt in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,863,685 to Davila et al. (Davila). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The MPEP, in section 706.02(j), sets forth the basic criteria that must be met in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness:

“To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant’s disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d,488,20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir. 1991). See MPEP § 2143 - § 2143.03 for decisions pertinent to each of these criteria.”

Section 2143.03 of the MPEP clarifies certain criteria in section 706.02(j).

“To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1074). “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).”

Davila fails to disclose or suggest the unique offset configuration as claimed in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration or withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Serial No. 10/350,397

A favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl J. Evens/

By: _____
Carl J. Evens
Reg. No. 33,874

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2518
Dated: March 28, 2006